

Atty Dkt. No.: CORA-001CIP2CON2

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1, 3-5 and 16-18, as well as newly added Claims 19 to 27, the only claims pending and currently under examination in this application.

The Examiner has first rejected Claims 1-5 over U.S. Patent No. 6,379,345; and Claims 17-18 over U.S. Patent No. 6,387,071 and Claim 16 over U.S. Patent No. 6,622,732, each under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. In view of the previously filed Terminal Disclaimer over each of these patents, this rejection may be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wright. Wright fails to teach administration of an acidic solution having a pH ranging from 0 to 1.0, as now required in the above-amended claims. Accordingly, this rejection may be withdrawn.

Next, Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Wright in view of Briskin. As pointed out above, Wright is deficient in failing to teach use of a fluid having a pH ranging from 0 to 1.0. As Briskin has been cited solely for the element of applying an additional energy source, Briskin fails to make up this fundamental deficiency in Wright. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 5 are not obvious over Wright in view of Briskin and this rejection may be withdrawn.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Wright. As pointed out above, Wright is deficient in failing to teach use of a fluid having a pH ranging from 0 to 1.0. Accordingly, this rejection may be withdrawn.

With respect to newly added Claims 19 to 21, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as provided with above with respect to Claim 1, but are even further distinguished from the art in terms of specifying the nature of the acid in the acidic solution.

Atty Dkt. No.: CORA-001CIP2CON2

With respect to newly added Claims 19 to 21, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, but are even further distinguished from the art in terms of specifying the nature of the acid in the acidic solution, and that the solution by hypertonic, which elements are not present in the cited references.

With respect to newly added Claims 22 to 24, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 16, but are even further distinguished from the art in terms of specifying the nature of the acid in the acidic solution, and that the solution by hypertonic, which elements are not present in the cited references.

With respect to newly added Claims 25-27, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 8, but are even further distinguished from the art in terms of specifying the nature of the acid in the acidic solution, and that the solution by hypertonic, which elements are not present in the cited references.

Atty Dkt. No.: CORA-001CIP2CON2

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number CORA-001CIP2CON2.

Respectfully submitted,

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: May 26, 2005

By: 

Bret E. Field
Registration No. 37,620

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
1900 University Avenue, Suite 200
East Palo Alto, CA 94301
Telephone: (650) 327-3400
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231

F:\DOCUMENT\Cora\001clp2con2\response to office communication of 5-19-05.doc